

MISSOURI WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF OSEP'S FOUR-PART ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

OSEP Continuous Improvement	OSEP Focused Monitoring	OSEP Systems Verification	OSEP High Risk
Supporting each state in assessing performance and compliance, and in planning, implementing and evaluating improvement strategies. Resulting APRs combine self-assessing, improvement planning and performance reporting	Focusing on states with low performance in critical areas	Verifying effectiveness and accuracy of systems	Focusing on systems in high risk of failure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missouri Self-assessment (SA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organized by cluster areas, components and indicators provided by OSEP ○ Part B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering committee was the Advisory Panel (SEAP) ▪ Six committees met June – Sept 2001 ▪ Additional data gathering: Nov 01-July 02 ○ Part C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering committee was a subcommittee of the SICC ▪ Subcommittee and DESE wrote the SA ○ Finalized and submitted to OSEP: October 2002 ○ OSEP response: March 2003 ○ OSEP's major findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Part B: Monitoring programs for youth in city and county jails ▪ Part C: Child find, correction of previous noncompliance, timelines • Missouri Improvement Plan (IP): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Established benchmarks/targets and activities for 2003-04 – 2008-2009 ○ Part B priority areas: Elementary achievement and post-secondary outcomes (identified by SEAP), monitoring programs for youth in city/county jails (area of noncompliance) ○ Part B committees identified root causes and strategies for improvement ○ Part C priority areas: Child find, correction of non-compliance, timelines, Part C monitoring system, interagency agreements, personnel, service coordination, evaluation/ assessment, family-centered services, early childhood transition ○ Part C IP was combined with the Part C APR for 2001-2002 ○ Submitted to OSEP: July 2003 ○ OSEP response: May 2004 ○ OSEP's major findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Part B: Monitoring for city/county jails, noncompliance with statewide assessment regs, interagency collaboration, impact of personnel shortages ▪ Part C: Identification and correction of all noncompliance in all agencies that carry out Part C; all eligible children are identified, located and evaluated; evaluation and assessment completed within 45 days of referral; additional data collection and reporting needs • Missouri Annual Performance Reports for Part B and Part C (APR): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Performance report for 2002-03 and future activities for 2003-04 ○ Combines data reporting/analysis and improvement planning into one document ○ Organized by clusters, questions (components) and probes (indicators) ○ Largely a repeat of the IP since both covered the same “future” period ○ Submitted to OSEP: April 2004 ○ OSEP's response: None as of June 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All states ranked by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School completion ▪ Placement in LRE ○ Part C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification rates ▪ Settings • OSEP intervention focused on states with lowest rankings • Missouri in middle of state rankings on all measures except for Part C identification rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSEP visiting all states • Looking at monitoring, assessment and data collection for Parts B and C • Missouri's visit: December 2003 • <u>OSEP response: May 2004</u> • OSEP's major findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monitoring programs for youth in city and county jails ○ Timely (within one year) correction of noncompliance at LEAs ○ Ensuring correction of all noncompliance (removing 80% standard) ○ Ensuring accuracy of data reported by LEAs ○ Ensuring that all children participate in state and district wide assessments ○ Reporting performance on MAP-A Part C: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification and correction of all noncompliance for all agencies ○ Need better data collection on personnel and child and family outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only states in high risk of compliance, financial and/or management failure • Missouri not high risk

Missouri within the Framework of OSEP's Four-Part Accountability Process

Missouri Timeline for CIMP/APR Process

